

priest, and the true sabbath will extend its blessed rest over all time.

It was to promote this change in the general mind and heart, and to produce its happy results, especially with regard to the great right to life, that the non-resistance movement was begun. It is the business of those who have espoused it to see to it that their lives and conversation be a continual proclamation of the faith that has been given them. All reforms begin with individuals, and by slow degrees move the masses. The many may choose to dwell in the valley of the shadow of death, but they cannot prevent us from climbing the airy heights of the mountain of God. They may remain joined to their barbarisms, if they please, but they cannot hinder us from entering into the rest of a true civilization. We can never be compelled by any power in the universe to despise or invade any, even the least, of the right of others. We may meet with the fate which has attended the few who have advanced beyond their age in civilization—but then we shall have their reward. The Heavenly Jerusalem has even now descended like a bride on each, and we may enter into and possess it, if we will. Nay, we have but to open our eyes and to become conscious of our true life, and we find ourselves already reading its golden pavements, encompassed by its jasper walls, and bathed in its crystal light.

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1842.

Editorial Responsibility.

I propose, in future, to be very liberal towards all Christians—all lovers of truth and holiness and human salvation—in the matter of publishing—writers to be considered themselves alone responsible for what they communicate. To insure a place in the Telegraph, every piece involving in any way a statement of facts, must be accompanied with a responsible signature to be at least kept in my hands: and the more who consent to accompany their published communications with their own proper signatures, the better. It strikes me that the propriety and usefulness of the entire course marked out in this paragraph will be apparent to every liberal & unbiased mind.

For the Telegraph.

Brother Murray:—Having seen that the language we made use of in our Address in the first number of the Journal, has been construed to signify what we by no means intended, and a meaning put upon it prejudicial to the candor if not veracity of the Committee, we feel ourselves entitled to a small space in your paper for our vindication.

We have been charged in effect with having used language calculated and designed to represent ourselves as appointed by an act of the Convention, and with thus attempting to deceive the churches.

In answer to this we deem it sufficient to say that we had no such design whatever. We say in the Address, "During the meeting of the Convention at Poultney," for the purpose of specifying the time and the place of our appointment, and for no other purpose. We stated two things as facts which are facts, viz: That we were appointed at Poultney, and during the meeting of the Convention; without the slightest intention of leading any one to infer that our appointment was an act of the Convention, as such. Had we been so appointed we should have said so, but no such thing was said, and no such thing was intended to be inferable. We ought perhaps to have foreseen that under existing circumstances our language would be exposed to misconstruction, and to have sought to be more definite, and considering the waste of ink and paper it has occasioned we regret we did not. But our aim was brevity—and knowing that the delegates from a large proportion of the churches were present, we supposed that the circumstances of our appointment would be sufficiently understood without going into them further. That we should design to deceive, and lead the public to infer that we were appointed by the Convention, must at once be seen to be preposterous. For must we not have understood that every member of the Convention would know it was not an act of theirs? Would not the Minutes of the Convention show this? How could we hope to avoid detection for a single day? Whatever may be thought of our integrity and candor, how could we have any possible motive in this case, to make such a miserable attempt at deception? We most solemnly disclaim the imputation.

JOSEPH FREEMAN,
RYLAND FLETCHER,
JOHN CONANT.

Brandon, April 21, 1842.

REMARKS.

This comes too late. The lateness of the appearance and all the circumstances show that it is extorted—that the Committee put forth such a piece as this now because they feel driven to it, and dare not longer withhold. When they see how their language is understood in Virginia, and feel the indignation of the honest rising against them at home, they perceive that a "dignified silence" will not longer answer their purpose. If they meant to show themselves honest men, why did they not correct themselves, at the suggestion of brother Thomas, in their Convention at Brandon?

But they have not mended the matter now, after all—but rather made it worse. They say—"knowing that the delegates from a large portion of the churches were present," &c. This is the third falsehood that has been stated in the case—and it is not the least of the three. In the first place, language was used which conveyed the idea to those who did not know to the contrary, that the Committee were appointed by the Convention. And the chairman of the Committee declared in their Brandon Convention that the language chosen "was not and need not be." Next, Samuel Griggs, member of the Board, and an active member of the ca-

bal, stated that the Committee were appointed by the Board. This turned out to be as false as the other—but was the least falsehood of the three; because it came from an individual only. Now the Committee say—"knowing that the delegates from a large portion of the churches were present we supposed that the circumstances of our appointment would be sufficiently understood without going into them further." Herein is contained what I pronounce to be the third flagrant falsehood. If, on the one hand, they mean to be understood that the persons comprising this caucus were acting in this thing as "delegates from the churches," authorized to transact this private business—it is false. They were sent there to transact public business, in a public manner—and with no instructions, so far as it pertained to most of them, and I presume every one of them, in reference to the business transacted in this convocation. What was done there, was done by individuals, on their own responsibility. If, on the other hand, they design to be understood, as the connection makes it more probable, that the "large proportion of the delegates from the churches," which they speak of, was any such number as would carry the intelligence of the transaction as it was, personally, with their own mouths, to the churches generally—this is also false, and they know it. I deny that it was any such general meeting, and call on them to publish names, showing the truth of their pretensions. It was only such a clan as Joseph Freeman could draw around him. As brother C. A. Thomas told me, at the time he contradicted "Deacon" Griggs' statement—"a few brethren got together in brother Hotchkiss' study" and did it. Even brother Thomas himself was not present. But this was the representation of the thing given him. I have inquired diligently, and have never been able to get any other representation of it—except the published false pretensions of this Committee, given for effect, together with "Dea." Griggs' statement. There is another thing about it. They appear to pretend that a true representation of the case must have got to the churches through the delegates present. Now so far as it pertained to this region, the first notice of the matter that was heard, represented, just as the Committee represented in their address published in the specimen number of the Journal, that the getting up of the thing and the appointment of the Committee was an act of the Convention. I had occasion to contradict a statement that was going the rounds and giving such a version of the case, in less than ten days after the session of the Convention at Poultney. I presume the same view of the case was spread in other directions.

The wretched cant of the Committee, in regard to the "waste of ink and paper it has occasioned," is characteristic. If the waste of ink and paper is the principal cause of regret with them, it shows how reckless and regardless they are of truth. They manifest no regret that they have stated a falsehood. As long as they can afford to find "wear and tear" of conscience for dealing in falsehood, I will endeavor to contrive ways and means to furnish "ink and paper" for exposing them. I have already upwards of twenty new subscribers in Brandon, since their Convention was held here—the most of whom have entered their names voluntarily from having witnessed the clandestine proceedings of the Convention, or have given their names at the suggestion of others who attended and beheld. The small profits from these will help me along some, in obtaining "ink and paper."

The most pitiful and pitiable of all the things that appear in this "vindication" of the Committee is, their closing argument (?) to prove that they ought not to be supposed to have been so foolish as to be so dishonest—in other words, that there ought to be more confidence reposed in their heads, than to suppose they would allow their hearts to be so corrupt! The same argument would be equally forcible and conclusive in the mouths of men-stealers and all other daring sinners. "How could we hope to avoid detection for a single day?" They did not avoid detection—whether they hoped to or not. And what then? Does this prove that they are not guilty? By no means—any more than the same argument would prove that the slaveholder, the forger, the public defaulter, or any other felon could not be guilty. Suppose that Benjamin Rathbun had come forward in court, and to prove himself innocent, had asked—"how could I hope to avoid detection for a single day? Whatever may be thought of my integrity and candor, how could I have any possible motive in the case, to make such a miserable attempt at deception?" The "attempt" was miserable enough, to be sure, in both cases. But would such a plea have cleared Rathbun in the minds of the discerning and intelligent? The plea would have been as good for him as it is for this Committee. "What possible motive," &c. The motive with Rathbun, it is plain, was money. The motive with the Committee, it is equally plain, was public favor. They, it is true, provided, in their artful choice of words, a way for "backing out" if they should be driven to it. But they have failed to secure to themselves the benefit of their own cunning provision, by waiting to be so hard driven before they would avail themselves of it. But what makes it still worse for them, in connection with taking themselves to their last resort, they have committed another outrage upon the truth, not unlike the former. Before the three men whose names are attached to the document I am now commenting on, venture too far on their own credit for "integrity and candor," let them make a different exhibition of themselves from what they have in the Telegraph in times past.

P. S. If this Committee will now show themselves designing to be honest men in future, let them place this piece of theirs in the Journal, where it belonged, and where it was incumbent on them to place it, or something else instead of it, more candid, frank and honest. Their fault was committed in that organ of theirs, and if this piece is designed as in any manner or degree a correction of themselves in the matter, it should have appeared there. Then if I had neglected to take proper notice of it in the Telegraph, it would have been in time and in character for them to call my attention to it. If they conclude to have the honesty to place it in the Journal, may be they will have the magnanimity to allow my remarks to accompany it. We shall see.

THE SABBATH.—Further remarks on this subject are necessarily deferred another week.

The "Vermont Baptist Journal."

This paper will receive less attention in the Telegraph, in future, than it has for a few weeks past. I could not justify myself in doing less than I have, hitherto, by way of exposing the fraudulent proceedings connected with getting up that paper. I do not promise now to let it alone in its sins—but will occupy the least space with it, that a sense of duty will allow. The second number is out. Instead of bringing an honest and frank recantation from the former Committee, it has an address from another Committee appointed by the Convention held at Brandon. This latter Committee, instead of taking up the former fraudulent proceeding by name, say—"the call for the Convention in whose name we address you, was issued by a committee appointed at Poultney, by a large number of brethren assembled, during the last annual meeting of the State Convention." This method of closing up a clandestine proceeding savors more of the jesuitism of a plotting popular clergy, and the craftiness of intriguing politicians, than of frank, open-day-light, out-spoken, honest men and Christians. The phrase—"a large number of brethren assembled"—is deceptive and false. They dare not undertake to publish names to bear themselves out in this assertion.

OUR INTERCOURSE WITH OTHER EDITORS.

The question is often asked, what course we mean to pursue towards other editors? We say here, once for all, and to all, we shall just mind our own business and leave others to do the same. We shall most cheerfully exchange with any or all of them, the courtesies usual in the profession, so long as we find honorable dealing on their part; but when we discover a resort to misrepresentation; when we find garbled extracts made and the truth tortured so as to make out a good case, and answer a party turn; when we see honesty and manliness of purpose crouching to Jesuitical juggling, we shall just cut loose from such men. In regard to them, we shall consult our own convenience, and the good of the cause of Christ. We have so much independence, that in such cases, we shall neither be browbeaten into a discussion, nor out of it, but shall discuss a matter, or let it alone, just as we please. Fortunately for us, we are such thorough-going non-resistants, that we can bear misrepresentation and abuse without filling our sheet with petty quarrels, or attempts to patch up our character.

Our rule will be honorable conduct towards honorable men; and no intercourse at all with a man after we detect him in low intrigue or disregard of the truth.—Vt. Bap. Journal.

Is not this a kind and courteous introduction of himself, on the part of this "new" Editor, towards other editors? This is the individual who treats men-stealers with such "kindness and affection," that he gets the highest praise from their advocates. In behalf of the whole fraternity, among whom this threatening, swaggering, flouting champion thus introduces himself with boyish bravado, I pronounce this debut to be a masterpiece of impudence. To take for granted beforehand that other editors are going to treat him as he here seems to conjecture, is fitting and becoming in that man only who can do such things as this Editor has already been convicted of doing, and as he is now doing in this very piece. Well, if he claims the privilege of judging that others will do what he will allow himself to be guilty of, I don't know what can be done about it. All I shall do at present will be, to deny, in behalf of the brotherhood, the justness of his rule. His threats, it will be perceived, are "terrible—very terrible!" Verily, are not "the spirit and principles" of the piece "suited to promote the piety and edification of our churches?"

From the Baptist Advocate.

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.—We exceedingly regret to read in last week's number of this paper a most uncourteous and unchristian attack upon the editor of the New York Baptist Register, our much esteemed Br. Beebe, in which, because the paper is the property of the denomination in this State the editor is called "a tool!" Although different minds may variously regard the manner in which Br. Beebe views some of the modern efforts for the abolition of slavery, no one, who is acquainted with him or his writings, can doubt the independent character of his mind, the firmness of his purposes, or the purity of his motives. A long and gratefully cherished personal acquaintance gives us the privilege of uttering these sentiments in vindicating him from what we view as a totally unfounded aspersion.

The Vermont Telegraph.—The Baptist Advocate will accept our kind acknowledgments for the above generous defense of us against the abuse of the Vermont Telegraph. It was a question with us whether it would be becoming to pay any attention to it whatever. It was by no means the first display of the editor's indignation; our integrity and motives have been repeatedly assailed by him, and probably nothing but an acquiescence in all his wildness would obtain for us his favorable regard. He is sincere, unquestionably, in all his course, and we have not a feeling of unkindness to indulge towards him, but much of regret and lamentation that he occupies a place for which he is so utterly disqualified. He seems to be one of those kind of men of whom Br. Judson, some years ago, cautioned the Missionary Board about sending out as a fellow laborer with him "wrong headed and conscientious," who would ruin any cause in which he had a control; and indeed a distinguished member of the Baptist Anti-Slavery Society frankly stated to us on his return from their anniversary, year before last, that this

same gentleman with two others, named by him, would ruin their cause if they had the management of it. As we have therefore pretty carefully avoided ultraism in everything, and have endeavored to inquire what the Master, rather than what men, would approve, it is not surprising that we should be ridden over by the chariot of this Jehu. For our editorial brethren generally, we have ever entertained sentiments of high respect and esteem, and to differ with them on any point, has been matter of grief. From the infirmities of our nature, however, misunderstandings will now and then occur, and occasional temporary conflicts, but if the fraternal Christian country, [courtesy] so conspicuous in our brother of the Advocate, was more extensively exhibited, whatever might be such occasional differences, unlovely and unchristian asperities would never be permitted to mar the interchange of our remarks.—N. Y. Bap. Regr.

REMARKS.

Very well. Only give me credit for "conscientiousness"—it is all I ask. Only grant that my heart is right—my vanity shall never be allowed to ask anything for my head—that shall be left to take care of itself. Call me "wild"—call me "abusive"—call me "wrong headed"—only call me honest! If I reverse the matter, in my attitude towards brethren Beebe and Wyckoff, and, in my "sincerity" and "conscientiousness," hold my difficulty with their hearts, instead of their heads, they will of course be bound to overlook it in me, so long as they attribute it all to my "wrong headedness" merely! Whether they will be content and satisfied with this treatment or not, I shall continue to deal faithfully with them. That so-called "Christian courtesy" which sacrifices Christian faithfulness, is all delusion and affectation. This same courtesy which these Editors extend towards each other, and which they effect to extend towards me, they extend towards men-stealers and men-slayers. From such courtesy I pray to be delivered. They misname it. It is not Christian courtesy. The Author of Christianity used no such dissimulation; and he does not require or allow his followers to use it. They who think they have his approbation in it, deceive themselves.

The readers of the Telegraph are now furnished, from brother Beebe's own hand, a key to the proof of all the charges I bro't against him, in his single expression—"we have therefore pretty carefully avoided ultraism in everything." With him, anything that goes beyond what is popular with the party is ultra.

SERIOUS WARNING.—A young man named Jacob Payne, in attempting to rob the poultry-house of Mr. Gillum, Georgetown, D. C., on Friday last, was shot dead by a spring gun, which had been attached to the door of the goose-house in such a manner as to go off upon the entrance of an intruder. The entire load was lodged in his left side. Mr. Gillum had previously lost some of his poultry, which induced him to place the gun as described. An inquest was held over the body of the unfortunate youth, and the jury, after ascertaining the facts, rendered a verdict, in substance, that the setting of the gun was a justifiable act, and one for which Mr. Gillum was not amenable to the law.—Balt. Pat.

The foregoing is copied into the Christian Watchman without note or comment. The Editor in the same paper has a flaming eulogy of a new work advocating capital punishment, from which I infer his sympathy with the sentiments of this horrible paragraph. If he wishes not to be thus understood, I shall be happy to record his disclaimer. To justify killing a neighbor for robbing a goose-pen, is worthy of a community of human flesh mongers, who live by robbing their neighbors of their wives and children and of themselves! And why should not those who abet the latter sympathize with the former? A goose-stealer is worthy to be shot down dead! A man-stealer is worthy to be treated as a Christian—to be honored with the title of doctor of divinity—or to be made President of the United States!!

The following communication would have appeared sooner—but it got out of sight among other papers.

For the Telegraph.

Immediate Abolition.

MR. EDITOR:—Doubtless it is true that much of the dispute, which exists at the present day, among those who are desirous of the extinction of slavery, arises from some mutual misunderstanding in regard to the import of terms. Hence we submit the following interrogatories, viz:

What do you understand by the term, "instantaneous & universal emancipation?" And what true inference shall be drawn from the term, "immediate abolition of slavery?"

These questions are respectfully submitted to your notice, with the request that you give definite answers through the columns of your paper, as soon as convenient, and with the hope that when the public mind correctly appreciates your real sentiments it will embrace them.

Respectfully yours,

AMICUS HUMANITATIS.

ANSWER.

It appears to me that these interrogatories come at a late hour in the day. They pertain to the A, B, C of the enterprise. The child ten years old that has not been instructed in regard to them, has been sadly neglected in its education. Still there are two classes in society who have yet to learn what children ought before now to have known—and what the children of the common people do know. The former of these classes are those who assume to be the top

of society—the aristocracy—the doctors of divinity—the popular religious leaders [followers]—the leading politicians, &c. The latter are the bottom, the dregs of society—the sans culottes, in a word, all who are in the hands, and at the control of the former class. A striking illustration of the truth here presented, in relation to the former class, is exhibited in the recent temperance movements among members of Congress. These movements are at least ten years behind the times. They touch nothing but what the common people have arrived at, settled, taught to their children, and gone by, years ago. The doctors of divinity, the popular religious teachers (?) and their "fitting organs," are on the same ground with these members of Congress on this subject. The popular religious press is everywhere teeming with praises to these great men for doing these now small and gone-by things, and is congratulating the cause of temperance on account thereof. Well, perhaps it is a matter for congratulation that the load to be dragged along is to be in any degree lessened by any part of it commencing self-movement. The common people, who have all the work to do, will no doubt feel themselves greatly obliged, if these greatest hinderers of reform will remove the least of their hinderances. Such movements as are appearing at Washington in favor of Temperance—or rather to save the character of those who have hitherto, and as long as they dared to, given their influence on the other side of the question, are beginning to be manifest in different quarters towards Anti-Slavery.

For the special benefit of the two classes designated above, I will now proceed to answer my correspondent's questions.

By "instantaneous and universal emancipation" I mean "instantaneous and universal" abandonment of property in man—of merchandize in human beings. Slavery is a sin, and therefore ought to be immediately repented of and forsaken. There is as much propriety and Christian consistency in requiring men to leave off blasphemy or adultery by degrees, as in requiring them to leave off man-stealing and piracy by degrees. Suppose the Constitution of the U. States to have been framed so as to accommodate itself to sheep-stealing and horse-stealing. And suppose the New England States to have made these practices a paramount regulation of society—a "domestic institution"—a popular method of sustaining the aristocratic and popular part of community, in church as well as in state. What should we, what ought we to be understood to mean, by preaching the immediate abolition of these violations of God's law and of man's rights? Why, plainly, that there ought to be immediate repentance, and practices according therewith—that the thieves and robbers should not only stop stealing and robbing, but do all in their power to restore the stolen property to its rightful owners. Now sheep-stealing and horse-stealing are a very small matter indeed, compared with man-stealing, and woman-stealing, and child-stealing.

Some have ridiculed the idea of preaching "immediate abolition of slavery," because we have been preaching it these ten years and the work is not yet accomplished. And how long pray tell, has immediate repentance of other sins which men still continue in, been preached? For centuries. And because the sins are persisted in, is this a reason why immediate repentance and abandonment of them should not be preached? I understand that we are required to preach, whether the sinners will hear or forbear.

Perhaps my correspondent would wish me to be more full and explicit as to the duty of slaveholders, in the work of emancipation, and in connection therewith. Let them, then, as I said before, stop stealing, and go about restoring, immediately. Let them lift up those whom they have degraded and trodden down—give them employment and wages—furnish them the means of instruction, moral and religious. Let them abandon the hateful and murderous Colonization crusade. In a word, let them do as they would be done by, and act the part of human beings and Christians, towards their fellow beings.

Has my correspondent any further questions to ask? The Telegraph is open.

Two Thousand become Fifty Two Thousand.

The Temperance Journal says Mr. Tappan remarked at a late meeting in Boston, "that he held in his hand the report of the President of the Board of Physicians of New York, wherein it was stated that out of fifty two thousand pipes of wine consumed in this country, only two thousand were imported, the rest being made out of New England rum and other deleterious ingredients."—N. H. Bap. Regr.

Here is something for the consideration of brother Bronson, on one of the points in discussion between him and me, last week.

Brother Barna Allen has removed from Hubbardston to Whiting, and his correspondents are requested to direct to the latter place.

SECTARIANISM.—This subject shall be further and duly attended to, in due time. This, and some other things of a general nature, not depending on the time for their importance, are sometimes crowded by, to

give place to things of an ephemeral nature—creatures of the moment.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

BROTHER MURRAY:

I conceive it to be a matter of no small importance to be right side up—especially at such a time as this, when upon almost all subjects of reform, the great majority are wrong side up. What then is necessary to being right side up?

First, a right understanding of all matters in which we take an active part. For if we do not understand the subject in which we are engaged; or if we are misled by the judgment of others, to say the least, we shall be liable to act wrong.

Second, a love for the truth, because it is truth; and not a hatred to it, because it exposes wickedness.

Third, honesty—and that in practice as well as profession.

Now, Sir, without noticing other qualifications necessary to being right side up, I will remark, that, however right the course taken in getting it up cannot be right side up. I did think, on reading the address of the Committee, that what was done at the time of the last session of the Convention, was done in fair daylight. But, on reading your exposure of the whole matter, I concluded that it would need as many as sixteen on the oars and one at the helm, and those to be experienced hands too, in order to keep the right side up—for if the oarsmen should not keep time while passing through the rapids, it might prove a disastrous voyage.

But, to speak plain, I think the course pursued by those engaged in the enterprise of getting up a new paper, the most worthy of rebuke, of any thing that has come under my observation since I have had a standing with the denomination—I mean of a denominational character. I do not admit that it was the act of the denomination. But such were its claims, and representations. Just as though a paper devoted to the whole truth could not be started and sustained without deception. When I looked at the imposition upon the public, I was astonished. But when I reflect that there are those in the church and ministry who apologize for slavery, and will not exclude a licentious man for fear of losing support, and for the same reason will smooth over the conduct of a real jockey, I must think deception is the legitimate fruit of a time-serving, man-pleasing spirit. Then I exclaim, "O my soul! come not thou unto their secret, unto their assembly mine honor be not thou united." And really I want no better reason for sustaining the Telegraph than the Deacon gave—the want of a place where the truth can be spoken!

Go on my brother. And as long as your paper is in its present form you shall have my influence, such as it is. And rest assured it will be known, (if not before, it will at the judgement day,) who is right side up.

W. J. K.
April, 1842.

REMARKS.

The foregoing is from a working man in the ministry—a self made man, who has devoted himself, not to the concealing of as much truth as is unpopular with a wicked and perverse generation—but to the unfolding of truth, popular or unpopular. From such a man the cause of reform has a right to expect much, and if such an expectation fail I shall be disappointed.

Once More.

A good Brother called on me recently with a complaint that ought to have come from brother C. A. Thomas—and to have come before now, if it were coming at all. Brother Thomas tells the other brother that in the interview he had with me, which resulted in my publishing a correction as to the occasion of his four sermons, he told me that he observed, on the seats in the Vestry, during the Non-Resistance meetings, diverse copies of the Non-Resistant, containing an article touching the Sabbath. This he wishes to have understood as furnishing a part of the occasion for his discourses, in connection with the private interview with Henry C. Wright.

Well Said, if Well Meant.

I heard a discourse last Sabbath, some part of which I was sorry not to have the means of reporting. The speaker was brother Rockwood, from Rutland, occupying the Baptist pulpit in this village. I was particularly gratified with his allusion to the ecclesiastical tyranny and domination often exercised by religious bodies in cutting off those more pure and faithful than themselves. Then his "come-out-from-among-them" doctrine was capital! He showed forth most admirably the strength, and power of accomplishment, that would be possessed by the faithful few if they would [I don't know but he said should,